Remarks/Arguments

Interview Summary

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for granting the interview held on March 21, 2007. The information discussed below was presented at the interview.

Response

Claims 11, 19, 21, 28, 29, 43-52, 54, 56, 58-60, and 65 are cancelled. Claims 9-10, 12-18, 20, 22-27, 30-42, 53, 55, 57, 61-64 and 66-96 are pending in the present application. Claims 9, 42 and 74 are the independent claims. Claims 77-96 are newly added claims. No new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 USC 103(a)

The Office Action rejected Claims 9-22 and 25-74 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable. Claims 9, 42, and 74 are the pending independent claims. Claim 9 was rejected as unpatentable over Robertazzi et al. further in view of Hortensius et al., Wade et al., Regenold, Enmei, Glick, and Besemer. Claims 42 and 74 were rejected for the same reasons. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

With specific reference to Claim 9, the Office Action states that Claim 9 is unpatentable over Robertazzi in view of Hortensius et al., Wade et al., Regenold, Enmie, Glich, and Besemer due to obviousness. In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 USC 103(a), the reference(s) must teach or suggest all limitations of the claim. In particular, none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the feature of each PC including an internal firewall capable of allowing and/or denying access to portions of a microchip both to a

REST\59375LI

user of the personal computer and to a user from a network. This feature is present in independent claims 9, 42, and 74. This feature is supported on page 74 and corresponding FIGURES 17A-17D of the application, including Figure 17D showing a microchip 90.

With respect to Besemer, the Office Action states that Robertazzi does not teach the PC including a firewall, but that in the similar field of sharing computer resources over a network, Besemer teaches a firewall for regulating access to hardware from another computer.

Applicant disagrees. Besemer does not teach a firewall. Besemer discloses only an architecture and methodology for coupling a multiple number of processing systems in a controlled fashion whereby certain memory resources are shared and certain memory resources are restricted (i.e., not shared), presumably being controlled by corporate IT managers of a global memory module (GMM). See Besemer, column 1, lines 45-60. This does not constitute a firewall as claimed by the Applicant. Besemer was filed in 1978, well before the Internet or firewalls were utilized. In fact, Besemer does not even mention the words firewall or security. In Besemer, the GMM is used to allocate resources for a system where memory is very limited. Besemer is a pre-Internet embodiment, and seems to have been used in a corporate environment of trusted users, and thus would reside within a corporate network firewall in today's technological environment.

Furthermore, Besemer primarily teaches a GMM which has no processor or resources of its own and is therefore neither a server nor a PC as claimed by the Applicant. In fact, Besemer predates by several years the invention of the PC.

As Claims 9, 42, and 74 include the feature of an internal firewall residing on a PC, the internal firewall capable of allowing and/or denying access to portions of a microchip both to a user of the personal computer and to a user from a network. Thus, these claims are patentable.

Claims 10, 12-18, 20, 22-27, 30-41, 53, 55, 57, 61-64, 66-73, and 75-96 depend, either directly or indirectly, on Claims 9 and 42, and 74, and are thus patentable for the same reasons. Applicant notes that support for the newly added claims can be found, for example, as follows: Claims 77-78 (see original Claim 1); Claims 79 -82, 93-94 (see FIGURE 17A and accompanying description on page 74); Claims 83-84 (see FIGURE 17A and accompanying description in the first paragraph on page 74); Claims 86-88 (see last paragraph on page 39); Claims 89-92 (see FIGURES 17D and accompanying explanation on page 74); Claim 95 (see FIGURE 10A and accompanying explanation in the first paragraph on page 40); and Claim 96 (see original Claim 30).

Conclusion

Applicant believes the objections and rejections in the Office Action have been addressed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone should the Examiner believe that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER US LLP

Lisa K. Norton
Registration No. 44,977
Attorney for Applicant

LKN/maf
PO Box 9271
Reston, VA 20195
(703) 773.4149 Telephone
(703) 773.5200 Fax

Attachments

21

REST\593751.1